



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Deer Creek & Tule River Authority	County	Tulare
Project Title	Remote Sensing and Water Balance Model	Grant Request	\$ 83,399.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 83,399.00

Project Description: The project develops a calibrated model that combines remote sensing with daily root zone water balance simulation (at the field scale) to provide estimates of crop evapotranspiration of applied water for the period of 2007 – 2011. This model is used with satellite imagery to estimate basin water demands.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	6
Budget	3
Schedule	4
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	29

- **GWMP or Program:** The applicant Deer Creek and Tule River Authority (DCTRA) formally adopted a GWMP first in March 1995. DCTRA has subsequently revised and adopted updated GWMPs in July 2005 and in May 2012. Applicant provides minutes from the May 2012 adoption meeting.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. For example, the description of the project lacks detail as to what the proposed project intends to accomplish and how it will be accomplished. The project description includes the goals of the proposal and a map of the area covered by the model (Att. A). However, the applicant does not provide an explanation of how ongoing use of the model will be funded after grant funds are expended. Also, the proposal lacks detail regarding how groundwater users, stakeholders, and the general public will be informed about the project or how they will receive relevant reports and data. Applicant does not demonstrate collaboration between local public agencies with regard to the management of the affected groundwater basin.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Work Plan describes in great detail each task in the Scope of Work and divides each task into sub-tasks to further explain the work to be done. The Proposed Methodology imparts an understandable explanation of the combined remote sensing of crop transpiration and a daily root zone water balance model. The Project Deliverables consist of monthly progress reports to the DCTRA Project Manager, quarterly reports to DWR, and a final report to stakeholders and the public. Tasks 1-7 of Phase I are consistent with the Budget and the Schedule, but there is a Task 8 that doesn't appear in either the Budget or Schedule. It appears that some sub-tasks in Task 8 are discussed in the Budget detail for Task 7. In addition, Task 7 in the work plan does not match Task 7 in the budget and schedule. Furthermore, the Work Plan described a Phase II which is not in the Budget or Schedule.
- **Budget:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Budget includes labor categories, hourly rates, and an estimate of hours for each task. However, under the Principal Engineer labor category, reimbursable costs are listed as a total dollar amount with no explanation of how that sum was derived. The Budget is not entirely consistent with the Work Plan and Schedule, as Task 7 in the Budget does not match Task 7 in the Work Plan. Also, Task 8 in the Budget is not included in the Work Plan. The fixed DCTRA Administration Cost of 5% applied to each task is not explained or broken down by hours or labor categories. This Administration Cost is in addition to the Administration Fees applied to each task, which raises further questions as to the purpose.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Schedule:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The Schedule includes timelines that are realistic for the work to be performed and that agree with the Work Plan sequencing and the budget. The start date of 04/01/13 and the end date of 11/11/13 are within the PSP designated time frame. However, the Overall Project End Date is 07/29/13 while the End Date for Task 7 is 11/11/13, which is unclear.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. For example, Applicant provides well-defined QA/QC measures that are consistent with and included in the work plan. The QA/QC measures are broken into two categories: project procedural/management and project technical QA/QC. The Technical QA/QC measures include Technical Data QA/QC, Professional Qualifications, and Calibration of Data QA/QC.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant describes how it has administered and worked on a previous grant from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) to improve wildlife habitat at a groundwater recharge facility along Deer Creek. The proposal has a table of NFWF grant financial reporting data including actual expenses which exceeded NFWF budget allocations. There is no explanation of why the exceedance occurred or whether it was approved by NFWF. Also, the applicant provides very little detail on how the project was completed within a fixed time frame (only “The project finished on time.”). For supporting documentation applicant includes an Itemization of Grant Funds for the Project and the Project Final Accounting Ledger. However, these documents do not provide adequate support of claimed performance. The applicant notes that they received a Certificate of Environmental Achievement from the National Awards Council for Environmental Sustainability for the design work done on the project.